

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and Allowance of Claims 1-20 in view of the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Kato et al. U.S. Patent 6,631,495. Independent claim 11 was also rejected on these same grounds but was left off of the claim rejection listing.

35 U.S.C. §103 REJECTIONS

Dependent claims 4, 8-10, 12, 13 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Kato in view of Antognini et al. U.S. Patent 6,176,427.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in this case.

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 11 AND 14 ARE NOT TAUGHT OR SUGGESTED BY THE CITED ART

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,631,495 to Kato et al. (Kato). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the ground that Kato, whether alone or in combination, does not describe or suggest Applicant's invention as claimed and, further, there is no suggestion in any of the references to modify the Kato device so as to render obvious Applicant's invention.

THE KATO PATENT

The Kato patent discloses an electronic document filing method and system consisting of adding identification code to the electronic document. (Abstract). In particular, Kato discloses a method and system for adding an identification code to a particular

document without narrowing the document print area or interfering with the document layout, for the ultimate purpose of retrieving the corresponding electronic document based on the identification code. (See, e.g., Column 2, lines 61-67; Column 3, lines 9-10; Column 10, lines 18-23).

Nothing in Kato teaches machine readable code, directed to additional information, added to said printed material as required in pertinent part by each of the independent claims 1, 11 and 14. As set forth at page 7, lines 28-31, for example, Applicant specifically defined the term "additional information": "For the purposes of this invention, it is to be understood that what is meant by "additional information" is information on a separate, local or remote, database considered relevant to the printed material 14 on which the machine readable code 12 is added." (See also, page 4, lines 24-31; page 5, lines 18-34 and page 6, lines 1-3; and page 7, lines 28-34 and page 8, lines 1-3, for example).

Simply put, Kato is directed to identifying a particular document and adding a code to retrieve that particular document. Applicant's invention is not concerned with retrieving the document upon which the code is printed but uses the code to locate other relevant additional information.

THE ANTOGNINI PATENT

The Antognini patent discloses a method of formatting data and a method of decoding the formatted digital data. (Abstract). Nothing in Antognini teaches Applicant's invention, as the Examiner admits, or suggests it as it is claimed as discussed above. Further, as set forth above, nothing in Kato teaches or suggests Applicant's invention. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that it is impossible for the combination to teach or suggest Applicant's invention as claimed.

The Applicant therefore respectfully submits that independent Claim 1, as well as independent Claims 11 and 14 which require limitations similar to those in Claim 1, are not anticipated by, nor obvious over, Kato either alone or in combination with Antognini and are

entitled to allowance along with dependent claims 2-10 from Claim 1, dependent claims 12-13 from Claim 11 and dependent claims 15-20 from Claim 14.

CITED BUT NON-APPLIED REFERENCES

The subsidiary references have been reviewed but are submitted to be less relevant than the relied upon references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-20. If the Examiner should feel that any issue remains as to the allowability of these claims, or that a conference might expedite allowance of the claims, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Applicant intends this to be a complete response. No fee is believed due; however if a fee is due, please charge the deposit account number indicated on the transmittal letter.

Respectfully submitted,

SHAFFER & CULBERTSON, L.L.P.

Date: 22 Jun 04

By: 

J. Nevin Shaffer, Jr., Reg. No. 29,858

Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124

1114 Lost Creek Blvd, Suite 420

Austin, Texas 78746

512-327-8932 or 850-934-4124

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: 22 Jun 04
Reg. No. 29,858, J. Nevin Shaffer, Jr.

